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# Introduction

Ato Zelalem opened the meeting with welcome address, and by facilitating self-introduction by the participants. Following the self-introduction he described the agendas of the meeting. He also mentioned that the main purpose of the meeting is to work on prioritizing the main workable issue based on the previous prioritized issues both at community and IP level that will lead to pilot for joint action.

Besides, Ato Zelalem refreshed the participants with what have been done during the first innovation platform meeting. Among the recalled issues, the major problems identified by different groups through discussion were the major. He mentioned that at IP level the main issue agreed as a problem for Jeldu woreda was ‘soil erosion’ and it was agreed to consult the communities before the IP members take this forward to work on.

Ato Abera also presented the problems identified during the community’s discussion. It was learnt that the problems identified by the community have some overlapping with that of IP members. But, there is a difference in prioritization. As indicated by Ato Abera, farmers of Jeldu Woreda identified the following problems in order of importance to them: Soil erosion, Deforestation, Crops Disease, lack of clean water (for drinking), and lack of animal feeds. Finally, Ato Abera mentioned that those identified problems by the farmers have the implication that the community should be involved in identifying the appropriate solutions/interventions and implementations activities.

# Problem Prioritization

The next discussion, which was led by Ato Zelalem, was on how to link and prioritize the lists of identified problems by different groups including the community, and come to a single most important problem for intervention at pilot level. Before a discussion started on this point, he briefed on the Innovation Platform Challenge Fund and in order to utilize the fund for the pilot there is a proposal that would be developed by the core-IP members. He mentioned the list of five criteria that needs to be considered to prioritize the problems and to develop the proposal for the Challenge Fund.

Ato Zelalem then invited the participant to suggest on the procedure how to select the most important problem (issue) for the joint action to pilot. Ato Abera listed the communities as well as the IP level prioritized issues on flipchart in front of the participants.

## Suggestions and discussion at plenary

Ato Ayehu Legesse, from GIZ SLM Oromia, mentioned that GIZ have a big program in the five kebeles of the NBDC in the woreda and suggested to focus on identifying the gap from the current ongoing interventions at watershed level so that the pilot will complement and strengthen the existing practices for better impact. He listed several activities that GIZ is having intervention including, soil degradation, forestry, spring development etc. He also indicated the gap they have, such as livestock feeds and free grazing. He also underlined that even though, there are some existing practices of planting fodder trees in many areas of the country including Jeldu, the practice couldn’t go beyond using the trees as ornamentals and just trees for shade. There is no evident practice of utilizing the fodder trees and forages as valuable livestock feed. Therefore, this is a potential gap to be filled by partners through demonstrating promising feeding practices and promotion.

**Ato Shiferaw,** who is new for the platform from GIZ also augmented with same information about their intervention in their watershed. But, he first asked whether this project (pilot) site overlap with their (GIZ’s) watershed.

According to Ao Shiferaw, GIZ is working on soil conservation including afforestation and implementation of any appropriate technologies, spring development for drinking water, on crosscutting issues like Gender and others. He also mentioned their experience and support on land certification in other areas of the country.

Ato Alemayehu answered Ato Shiferaw’s question that the pilot site is within the GIZ’s watershed by mentioning the Meja River and Kebele Administrations that it crosses. He also mentioned about the different hydrological and other weather instruments installed by IWMI and there is a coordinator assigned to collect data and coordinate the research.

**Question (by one of the expert):** If the GIZ is working in the villages you selected, why don’t you select other villages in which the GIZ is not working? Because our woreda have a lot of Kebele Administrations and it is better to work also in other areas where GIZ is not working.

**Ans**: Ato Alemayehu mentioned that this is an action research project and ILRI is not here as an implementer. The idea is to initiate an innovation process whereby stakeholders come together and plan and pilot a joint action for learning. Hence the IF should be seen as a seed money to initiate a joint action and whatever comes out of this process intends to complement GIZ-SLM-Oromia’s work not to substitute. The pilot is a mini project with little budget meant for IP members to do joint actions for learning and scaling-up. I think it is better to work together and make a joint effort for better impact. For instance if we select to work on deforestation, it is very broad issue and it is possible to try to work on untouched part by GIZ so that it will complement and make a difference.

**Support by GIZ:** If we are going to work in a different village, it is going to fragment and the effect will not be bold and clearly visible. If we see the cause and effect relationships of the identified problems like soil erosion, deforestation, population pressure, it will be easier to deal with in the way that it will not overlapping.

Ato Abera also added that the Challenge Fund is a pilot for action research and if it will be successful it will be used as a model and will be duplicated within the woreda or beyond, and at the same time, the GIZ can easily overtake and continue the work. Within the IP office of agriculture and GIZ and other potential members are the main partners for uptake of the findings of the pilot for scaling out/up.

Ato Shiferaw explained their experience on how their project is managed in GIZ. He said there are three parties: the government, the funding organization/countries and the GIZ. The Government is the owner of the project implementing and even the money is deposited in a government account, while the GIZ provides technical support for the implementation of the project.

Ato Dagne, from Holetta Agri. Research Centre, also shared their experiences in watershed management for prioritizing the issues for interventions. They have similar platforms at woreda level and also they have at community level. The community level watershed committee members that comprises about 12 representatives work on issues that the community themselves prioritized. They interview randomly selected farmers and collect the main issues in the watershed management and the intervention will base on the communities issues.

With regard to the prioritization of the problem, Ato Shiferaw remarked that they follow similar procedure as mentioned from Holetta, which is total dependence on the community’s views. But, he mentioned that he cannot say the NBDC’s procedure is wrong and it is possible to use it as the issues prioritized by the IP members who are the main actors and implementers of government bodies and merging it with the communities issue is also a better way of doing it and we will draw a lesson from this approach too. As the suggestion, he indicated either to use the cause- effect relationship, or Matrix (selecting the most frequently mentioned problem)

**Suggestion from a DA**: He indicated that GIZ has no plan on livestock feed yet, and he preferred to focus on the feeds as the budget is also limited. Since lack of feed is also a cause for free grazing which in turn aggravated soil erosion.

Another participant suggested that focusing on soil erosion as a problem and intervening on livestock feed since free grazing is one of the causes for soil erosion.

Ato Zelalem then accepted the suggestions and guided that soil erosion can be taken as a main issue for the woreda and the IP members can work on different causes such as deforestation, livestock feeds, etc. He highlighted as an example that working on deforestation means working on soil erosion. He summarized the discussion and requested all IP members if they agree a ‘soil erosion’, which was the main issue for the IP members during the first meeting and also came as the first issue for communities based on Ato Abera’s presentation, can be a main issues. All the IP members agreed that “soil Erosion” is the main issue that IP will focus on but for piloting one cause can be worked on.

Another participant added that the major problem in the area is “soil erosion” as mentioned by many groups. But, one of the causes is deforestation that is in turn caused by population growth. Since, we cannot work on population growth, it is better to work on deforestation and other causes of soil erosion.

Ato Shiferaw, mentioned we have to consider what to address and where. For instance, if we focus on deforestation on hillside, area closure could be solution. But, if it is on farmland we cannot address by afforestation. On, farmland livestock is also a problem. Farmers remove the crop residue from the farm for the livestock feed. So, we have to think of the appropriate issue for this pilot intervention. He suggested that with this limited budget from the Challenge Fund we cannot address soil erosion by conservation and also because the existing practices by government and GIZ focussed on conservation, so we should better focus on livestock feed, free grazing, etc, which is one of the factor for soil erosion and can complement the existing practice.

After very hot discussion on how to select the most important problem out of the identified problems, the IP members came to the consensus to intervene or work on livestock feeds, while the main problem in focus being soil erosion. They strengthened also ILRI will support on this issue of the livestock feed with feed technologies and livestock researches that will contribute to the productivity of livestock and minimize the soil erosion.

# Group discussion

The next step after consensuses was made on which problem to focus, three groups were formed and discussion was held on how better soil erosion can be limited through working on livestock feed problem. Ato Abera gave eight discussion points (guidelines) for the group to work on. These includes 1) Root cause, 2) Current working practices, 3) constraints, 4) suggested options, 5) what kind of improvements envisioned, 6) role of IP members, 7) coordinating institutions, 8) policy options.

A representative of each of the three groups presented the points identified during their discussion.
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## Table: Group Discussion questions and results

| **No** | **Discussion Points on Soil Erosion** | **Discussion Results as presented by each group** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group 1** | **Group 2** | **Group 3** |
| 1 | What are the root causes? | * Deforestation * Population growth * Free grazing * Illegal use of land * Land sliding * Land feature * Poverty * Shortage of land * Repeated cultivation of land | * Deforestation for housing, charcoal, extensive farming * Over grazing * Illegal farming practice: repeated cultivation and cleaning of forest lands for farming | * Topography * Deforestation * Improper land use * Poor farming practice * Population pressure * Over grazing * Lack of soil conservation structures |
| 2 | What are the current working practices? | * Area closure * Check dam (biological & physical) * Afforestation * Identification of land for grazing, cultivation, area closure (land use plan) * Team work * Putting effective practices in land | * Government is working currently on soil and water conservation through campaign * Physical structures (soil band, stone band...) * Biological Structure (seedling for different trees) * Community awareness is created * NGO(GIZ) problem is identified and plans are prepared * Sites are selected, communities are aware, * User groups are formed | * Biological and physical soil and water conservation structures * Area closure * Compost making |
| 3 | The constraints faced? | * Lack of equal awareness * Lack appropriate seedling and nursery sites * Lack of training for professionals * Lack of special attention * Inappropriate drainage system (not considering slope) * Ineffective land use plan * Free grazing * Lack of seedling | * Lack of livestock feed * Lack improved livestock feeds and different kinds of fodder tree seedlings * Lack of awareness on feeding practices * Free grazing | * Lack of sustainable management for the conservation structures * Free grazing practice and damage of the structures by livestock * Shortage of land * Low quality * Lack of skill * Lack of different livestock feeds * Lack of livestock feeding practice * Lack of forage planting material sources (seed and seedling) |
| 4 | Suggested options to overcome the constraints? | * Controlled grazing * Improving the knowledge / understanding of experts * Assignment of appropriate professionals for awareness training * Establishment and strengthening of nursery sites * Implementation of proper land use policy * Plantation of multi-purpose trees and fodder trees * Use of crop rotation (inter cropping) | * Improving livestock feeding system * Reducing the number of livetstock * Establishing nursery sites * Awareness creation * Improving livestock breeds * Improve clean water provision for livestock | * Proper design and quality * Build the skill of community to properly maintain the conservation structures * Awareness creation on use and importance of structures * Promoting sustainable livestock feed utilization * Technology integration (planting forage on physical structures) * Capacity building * Livestock feed development * Provision of forage seed and planting materials * Promoting feeding practices |
| 5 | What kinds of improvements envisaged? | * Minimize soil erosion * Increased production and productivity * Increased income * Better afforetstation activities * Improvement of ground water recharge | * Enhancing the capacity of the community, experts * Supply improved livestock feeds * Supply clean water for livestock * Supply improve livestock breed | * Land conserved * Increased production and productivity * Sustainable livestock feed development and utilized * Minimized free grazing * Sustainable soil and water conservation structured developed and managed |
| 6 | What would be the role of IP members? | * Sensitization * Not only the commanders put also implementers * Continues follow up * Familiarization of technological innovations * Scaling out best practices | * HARC -> supply improved livestock breeds and feeds * GIZ -> support the physical structures of soil and water conservation implementation and enhance the capacity of the community * ILRI -> support by fund and researching on issues under focus * W. Administration -> creating the conducive environment for the project | * Technology promotion * Mobilize community * Pool resources and knowledge * Joint action |
| 7 | Which institution will better coordinate the IP members’ activities? | * Local government body (Woreda Office of Agri. And Rural Development) | * Watershed management Steering committee at woreda level -> woreda administration * Technical support -> woreda office of Agriculture * ILRI -> make sure the multi-sector participatory approach | * Woreda office of Agri. & Rural Development office through assigning a focal person |
| 8 | What are the policy options? | * Community group establishment and respective by laws * Awareness creation * Governmental attention to Climate Change is good policy environment * Notational population policy | * There is a conducive policy environment on land use but there is no rules and regulations to be ratified | * Land use planning * Community by-laws in line with the policy |

# Action Plan Development

The Innovation Platform Challenge Fund proposal development was again briefed by Zelalem and he requested the members to select core-members who will develop the proposal for the fund. Since it is necessary to prepare a project protocol for the intervention based on the group work, the following office and individuals were selected as core members.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name of the Organization** | **Name of the person** | **Mobile** |
| 1 | Livestock Agency representative | Ato Tibebu Seifu | 0912208151 |
| 2 | GIZ focal person | Ato Abebe Feninsa | 0910861335 |
| 3 | Environmental and land Use office | Ato Tulu Merga | 0912208011 |
| 4 | Mining and Energy office | Ato Mangesha Tajebe | 0910434433 |
| 5 | Holetta Agricultural Research Centre | Ato Dagne Mojo | 0911366070 |

Coordinator and contact person of this core-team is selected to be Ato Tibebu Seifu of the Livestock Agency. NBDC team will be around to help in case of any need throughout the process.

Participants then discussed and decided that the action-research work should be started within three months and the IP meeting should be held within a month time.

After suggestion and discussion in which of the three kebele Administrations (KAs) that the activity should be done, a consensus has been reached to focus in Kolu Gelan PA. Hence, the pilot project will be implemented in Kolu PA after the core members develop the protocol.

Finally, some of the participants cautioned that future IP meetings should be held more frequently to begin the action research as the period between the past two meetings was a bit long ( over 7 months)

## 4.1 Actions set out

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **(What) Activities to be done** | **(Who) Responsible** | **(When) Date** |
| 1 | Developing the proposal within the coming month | The Core-team members with the support from NBDC (Zelalem and Abera) | Before the end of May 2012 |
| 2 | Inviting other suggested key IP members during the 1st IP meeting for the 3rd IP meeting | Zelalem and Abera | For the third IP meeting |
| 3 | Third IP Meeting | All members | with in a month (end of May 2012) |
| 4 | Distributing the 2nd IP meeting proceeding report to all members | Zelalem and Abera | During the 3rd IP meeting or while visiting Jeldu before the 3rd meeting |

M & E questions were answered on pieces of paper by individual participants at the end of the meeting

# Lessons learnt

* To strengthen the learning and sharing of knowledge and experiences we have to also invite similar organizations like GIZ or Holletta Research centre to share their experiences on watershed management, approach or technology options or even some research findings similar to the issue under discussion
* The meeting should be frequent to keep the members’ action and knowledge transfer to its best
* We have learnt that it takes time and makes the IP meeting too late to start because making a travel arrangement on the same day from Addis to Jeldu. It would be better to have one day in advance to be around with the members for closely arranging the meeting and have time to talk to members and create close communication
* We found that different representatives are coming on different IP meetings and we have raised the issue on how to have the same participant so that we can make sure that the continuation of building the knowledge of all members. They have agreed to assign one focal person from each organization and appropriate for the IP meeting who will continually follow up the meeting
* Having strong stake holders like GIZ and local research institutions in the IP creates a good opportunity for the relative sustainability of interventions and action research. Therefore, it is wise to work in close communication with them

# Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Agenda** | **Responsible** |
| 9:00 – 9:15 | Registration and introduction | Participants |
| 9:15 – 9:30 | Refreshing memories on the last IP meeting, especially on some of the land and water management issues which came out during the previous group discussions | Zelalem/Aberra/Alemayehu |
| 9:30 – 10:15 | Feeding back the community engagement exercise and some of the findings | Aberra |
| 10:15 – 10:45 | Coffee break | Organizers |
| 10:45 – 12:30 | Discussion and prioritization of key land and water management issue by combining outputs of the previous meeting and the findings of the community  After prioritization of an issue, initiate group discussion as follows:   * Identify current working practices around the selected issue * What the constraints on the issue are? * What role do they think they can play in addressing the issue? And what will be the communities’ role? NGOs? * What things they think should be focused on to improve the situation * What kind of improvement do they envisage?   (groups consisting of management, technical, DA and kebele people) | Zelalem/Aberra/Alemayehu |
| 12:30 – 1:30 | Lunch | Organizers |
| 1:30 – 3:00 | Develop a situation analysis  -Identification of root causes of the prioritized issues  -What are the technical options needed to address the challenge?  -Who can implement (Institutional partners)  -How (Institutional roles and responsibilities) | Zelalem/Aberra/Alemayehu |
| 3:00 – 3:30 | Coffee break | Organizers |
| 3:30 – 11:00 | Action Plan Development  -briefly introducing the Local Innovation fund  -selecting core members who would be working on proposals  -set out action points for the next meeting | Zelalem/Aberra/Alemayehu |

# List of participants at the 2nd Jeldu-Innovation Platform Meeting

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Office** | **Role/Responsibility** | **Contact Number** | **E-mail** |
| 1 | Sisay Mulisa | Woreda Office of Agriculture | Expert | 0920153941 |  |
| 2 | Girma Leta | Woreda Office of Administration and agriculture | Office head for agri./Deputy for admin | 0912208099 |  |
| 3 | Mengesha Tajebe | Woreda Office of water, mining and Energy office | Office Head | 0910434433 |  |
| 4 | Reta Mume | Cooperative Promotion Office | Chairman | 0912208391 |  |
| 5 | Calmssa Hikoo | Kulo Gelan Kebele Administration | Chairman | 0912208760 |  |
| 6 | Fikadu Debele | Woreda Office of Agriculture | Expert | 0910363404 |  |
| 7 | Mideksa Angasa | Chilanko Kebele Administration | Development Agent | 0912904590 |  |
| 8 | Bizunesh Workineh | Woreda Office of Agriculture | Extension team leader | 0912208027 |  |
| 9 | Kassa Negera | Kulo Gelan Kebele Administration | Development Agent | 0920156938 |  |
| 10 | Solomon Teklu | Sariti Dhangu Kebele Administration | Development Agent | 0910030785 |  |
| 11 | Tulu Merga | Woreda office of Agriculture | Expert | 0912208011 |  |
| 12 | Chala Tura | Sariti Dhangu Kebele Administration | Chairman | 0923631440 |  |
| 13 | Lelisa Eticha | Sariti Dhangu Kebele Administration | Development Agent | 0920116939 |  |
| 14 | Abdisa Isanbalu | Woreda office of Agriculture | Expert | 0913141864 |  |
| 15 | Tibebu Seifu | Woreda Livestock Agency | Office Head | 0912208151 |  |
| 16 | Abebe Firinsa | SLM-GIZ | Focal person | 0910861335 |  |
| 17 | Birihanu Sorii | Chilanko Kebele Administration | Chairman | 0921762488 |  |
| 18 | Ayehu Legesse | GIZ-SLM Oromia | Social Organization senior advisor | 0911155281 | [ayehu.legesse@giz.de](mailto:ayehu.legesse@giz.de) |
| 19 | Shiferaw Negesse | GIZ-SLM Oromia | Soil and Water Conservation Senior Advisor | 0911728119 | [shiferaw.negesse@giz.de](mailto:shiferaw.negesse@giz.de) |
| 20 | Dange Mojo | Holetta Agricultural Research Centre | Integrated Watershed Management Project Coordinator | 0911366070 | [dagnemojo@yahoo.com.au](mailto:dagnemojo@yahoo.com.au) |
| 21 | Abera Adie | International Livestock Research Institute | Researcher | 0910756003 | [A.ADIE@CGIAR.ORG](mailto:A.ADIE@CGIAR.ORG) |
| 22 | Zelalem Lema | RIPPLE | Researcher | 0911725449 | [z.lema@rippleethiopia.org](mailto:z.lema@rippleethiopia.org) |
| 23 | Alemayehu Belay | International Livestock Research Institute | Researcher | 0911885535 | [A.Belay@cgiar.org](mailto:A.Belay@cgiar.org) |
| 24 | Teshome Tirfesa | HUNDE |  |  |  |